

UNITY

MEADVILLE THEOLOGICAL
SCHOOL LIBRARY

CONTENTS

Editorial Comments	99
How Much Certainty Does Science Give Us?.....	101
<i>Paul E. Killinger</i>	
Apartment Glamour Girl.....	107
<i>Ethel S. Beer</i>	
Sputnik's Questions	113
<i>Stewart Meacham</i>	
Who Was Jesus, Anyhow?.....	115
<i>John M. Morris</i>	
Bookman's Notebook.....	121
Western Unitarian Conference.....	125

Nov.-Dec., 1958

Vol. CXLIV, No. 4

PRICE FIFTY CENTS

U N I T Y

Established 1878

RANDALL S. HILTON, *Editor*

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

ETHEL S. BEER—"Apartment Glamour Girl"—is an ardent advocate of Day Nurseries and a frequent contributor to UNITY.

PAUL E. KILLINGER—"How Much Certainty Does Science Give Us?"—is Minister of the Unitarian Fellowship of Bloomington, Indiana.

STEWART MEACHAM—"Sputnik's Questions"—is Director of the Labor-International Affairs Program of the American Friends Service Committee.

JOHN M. MORRIS—"Who Was Jesus, Anyhow?"—is Minister of the Unitarian Church of Quincy, Illinois.

CHARLES W. PHILLIPS—"Bookman's Notebook"—is Minister of the First Unitarian Church of Omaha, Nebraska, and a regular contributor to UNITY.

ELLSWORTH M. SMITH—"Western Conference News"—is Executive Secretary of the Western Unitarian Conference, and a regular contributor to UNITY.

Published bimonthly except during July and August
by the

Abraham Lincoln Centre
700 Oakwood Boulevard
Chicago 53, Illinois

Subscription \$2.

Single Copies 50 cents.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter October 7, 1952, at the postoffice at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of March 3, 1879."

Editorial Comments

THE Roman Catholic World has a new Pope. What his spiritual leadership may be remains to be seen. However, he has demonstrated exceptional physical endurance. We saw the kaleidoscoped television version of the four-hour coronation ceremonies. They were fabulous and must have been fatiguing. Yet the 76-year-old Pontiff, John XXIII, seemed stronger at the end than at the beginning. If this endurance were any test, one could predict a longer reign for him than may have been anticipated by the College of Cardinals.

The November 4th elections demonstrated that the basic political philosophy of the American people is liberal. There was very little in the results to cheer either the Republican or Democratic conservatives. The people may want a change from time to time, but not for long, if it is at the expense of progressive government.

It seems to us that now is the time for the liberals in the Senate to make some real advances in three significant areas: one, in changing Rule 22 which permits the filibuster; two, in enacting a meaningful civil rights law; and three, in abolishing the seniority

rule for committee chairmanships.

Senator Paul Douglas has indicated his intention to work against the filibuster and for civil rights. If the liberals stick together and do not indulge in political horse-trading these two ends can be achieved in the next session of Congress.

To eliminate the prerogatives of seniority from the party caucus procedures will be a bit more difficult but is equally essential. The party in power has a responsibility to make sure that the men to whom they give the power of committee chairmanships are devoted and loyal to the party's principles, platform, and policies. No man should be given such honor, authority, and power who has repudiated the party's principles just because his successful control of a political organization in a one-party state has maintained him in office for an unusual length of time.

Longevity in office should be neither a prerequisite nor a deterrent to such service. The qualification should be, can this man provide the best, constructive leadership in the areas with which the committee is concerned?

We congratulate the Joint Commission on Merger of the Ameri-

can Unitarian Association and the Universalist Church of America on its manual. It has presented many hitherto unrevealed facts. The facts and information here presented do give a basis for objective and rational discussion of the problems of merger. Heretofore, all the discussions we have heard on Federal Union and/or Merger have been warmly emotional and mostly irrational. The ardent proponents try to make those who oppose or raise questions feel as though they are denying the principle of Brotherhood.

As one who has worked in numerous Uni-Uni situations, we can testify to the ever-present feeling of brotherhood. But, we must admit that all too often the "togetherness" gets a bit sticky and the results disappointing.

The discussion of merger should not be decided on the lofty emotions of good will and wishful

thinking but rather on a frank facing of the facts and a careful consideration of all the factors involved.

We were pleased to receive in the same mail the other day two scholarly and interestingly written publications by two of our friends. Dr. Charles Francis Potter, author, lecturer, and humanist leader, has revised, enlarged and up-dated his popular book of a few years back, *The Story of Religion*. The new edition published by Simon and Schuster is entitled, *The Great Religious Leaders*. Dr. Harold Scott, Minister of the Unitarian Church in Salt Lake City, has privately published a paper-bound booklet on *Our Bible Heritage*. It is a succinct analysis of both the Old and New Testaments. Readers of UNITY would find these publications of interest and value.

Future Articles of Interest

America in Retrospect—Post Congress Reflections.....	A. B. Downing
The Origin of Good and Evil.....	Oscar Riddle
Teaching Morals in the Public School.....	William H. Kilpatrick
A Challenge to Adult Educators.....	James E. Amick
How Important Is Freedom?.....	Edith Hansen
Science and Religion As Revolutionary Forces.....	Leo F. Koch

How Much Certainty Does Science Give Us?

PAUL E. KILLINGER

SOMETIMES I have the feeling that mankind is being made into a marionette by its own shortcomings. Perhaps the most dangerous shortcoming of man in this mid-century is his glib ability to store ethical-moral knowledge in one part of his brain, and political, scientific, or social knowledge in another part. Men seem increasingly adept at erecting impenetrable walls in their minds, so that at just the moment in history when a vital, idealistic, even prophetic vision of world events is needed most these compartments of the brain prevent such an inspiring vision from developing.

For persons concerned with living an integrated, unified life this shortcoming which allows mankind to compartmentalize his thought is a danger to be aware of, even if it is not always successfully overcome in practice by any of us. Men today are under ever-increasing pressure to react to the demands of life and the events of day-to-day history in socially approved, stereotyped, and conforming ways—ways that have arisen from a general willingness to di-

vide life up into numerous separate categories and compartments. The general willingness to accept this division, and to accept the standard ways of responding to these divided, fragmented events concerns many people deeply. Modern man is said to be torn, divided in his loyalties; he is said not to know where he is going; he is a hollow shell reflecting the values of those above him whom he wants to be like. Man is said to lack direction, and also to be going off in all directions.

In his book, *A Preface to Morals*, Walter Lippmann says that "the religion of the spirit . . . is concerned with the quality of human desire." Here it seems is the crux of the matter, for men seem in too many cases to accept the make and model of their possessions as the mark of quality. Instead of seeking ever better quality in human life, they have accepted year-to-year obsolescence as a symbol for the quality. It seems to me that Edward Teller, so-called father of the H-bomb, and Robert Oppenheimer, so-called father of the A-bomb, represent these tendencies toward com-

partmentalization and integration in science, and in the attitude toward life which science may on occasion provide.

Edward Teller, physicist at the University of California and proponent of continued nuclear bomb testing, seems to me—in all that I have been able to read of his opinions—to be an example of the inflexible, compartmentalized person. But more than this—particularly in contrast to Robert Oppenheimer's apparent vision and integrating philosophical efforts—Edward Teller's political, and hence his moral, judgments seem threatening because of his public position as scientific spokesman. I fear deeply, and disagree deeply with, any scientist who is positive he knows the ultimate outcome of any course of action or experiment, especially in physics today. Teller speaks with the words of a scientist, but his conclusions have the ring of the theologian who would entertain *no* doubts as to the veracity of his system.

As I have been able to understand the methods and procedures of modern science, it seems to me that compartmentalization is anathema. In science a man is committed first to exploration, to doubt his experiment and its results, and to doubt most of all the possibility of predicting for all the years of the future exactly what will happen as his experiment is

repeated. The very method of science is not to believe anything with certainty, but to accept only the probability that if the sun has risen a million times before, it is very likely to rise tomorrow. The very nature of the word "certainty" is such as to give the scientist a cold sweat. And yet, for all this, I read again and again in Edward Teller's writings the certainty that hostility between Russia and the United States can only be prevented by armaments, nuclear, and otherwise. Teller has learned no philosophy from his science, and has none of the humility and all of the self-righteousness implied by the methods science has developed for discovering truth. Besides this, he speaks with what he proposes is certainty on the question of continued bomb testing, just as he does in the field of politics, where his background gives him no special rights.

The whole direction of Teller's thought, both in his testimony to the senate subcommittee last fall and in a more recent article in *Foreign Affairs* magazine, is what disturbs me more deeply. Teller seems to believe that there is an absolutely certain, infallible way of countering the Russian challenge in the world today. This way is through massive armaments, civilian preparedness, and as he says in one place by recog-

nizing that "this is a cold war of the class rooms." Teller seems to have wholly accepted the theory that there is no other way to resolve international hostility but to prepare a massive military and educational retaliatory force against the Russian threat. In his view of the purposes of education in this day, Teller views education not as an end in itself, but rather as a means to an end, as a means merely to defeat the cold-war enemy. Teller has fallen victim to the iron-curtain mentality which sees the world inexorably divided into two camps with only the possibility of hostility between them. Such is not the religious view nor the view implied by the methods of science itself.

Again Walter Lippmann in his book, *A Preface to Morals*, draws clearly the contrast that is so important here, the contrast between the philosophy of the spirit and the philosophy of the world. Lippmann says:

The ordinary man believes that he will be blessed if he is virtuous and therefore virtue seems to him a price he pays now for blessedness he will someday enjoy. While he is waiting for his reward. . . . virtue seems to him drab, arbitrary, and meaningless. The reward is deferred, and there is no instant proof that virtue really leads to the happiness he

has been promised.

It would seem that Edward Teller is this kind of ordinary man, lacking in the vision of virtue, and looking upon the methods of science and the benefits of education as mere expedient means to the end of conquering or defeating Russia. I find, then, that Edward Teller has not truly appreciated the deepest human meaning of the very science to which he is dedicated on the surface. He has looked for certainty in science; he would build dogma where only relative probability can sensibly exist. To the degree that he is a scientist he has neglected to open the doors in his brain between various thought processes, for he seems to admit only one possible and certain way out of our present international situation: the way of preparedness and maintenance of hostility between man and man.

This is all the worse because whatever may be one's opinion of how we must act in order to counteract Russian moves, the scientist is always bound to consider all possibilities, all alternatives. Teller, with the aura about his head that his personal scientific reputation gives him, considered only hostility and military preparation. Teller's search for a certain way to contain Russia goes against his scientific training because one can-

not mix scientific method on the one hand with a rigid interpretation of social or political events on the other.

I am concerned for yet another reason about Edward Teller's evident rigidity. Teller seems, over and over, to set up oversimplified logical relationships between scientific and political matters, and to find much too simple answers to our political problems in the international sphere. In *Life* magazine last February, Teller and a colleague wrote a goodly number of pages of words apologizing for and supporting more tests of nuclear weapons. In some respects this article presented a fairly strong case. But again there is evident this rigid interpretation of history, where, for example, it is said that "if we renounce nuclear weapons we open the door to aggression." Personally I do not think the matter is that simple, whether you happen to be for or against the renunciation of these weapons.

Edward Teller represents something to the American public. He is a moral symbol in an age when the scientist is increasingly becoming a moral symbol, albeit often a feared and a misunderstood one. The popular view seems to be that, so far as science has helped bring about the good life and helps to protect us from

our enemies, science is good. Certainly—so the feeling seems to go—if science has done all this, then scientists must know what they are talking about, and if they do know then they speak truth by implication in many areas of life; and hence they are as a class or a group regarded as a moral symbol. I think it is terribly dangerous to come to the place in our national life where we let a capable scientist influence the course of military or political events through the strength of his personal symbolism. He has no more right than any one of us to consider and discuss political matters, and no more right to be heard. And, because of the limits of scientific knowledge, he has no special right different from that of the citizen to decide on the reasonableness of further bomb testing. The trouble is that, as a moral symbol for some people, Teller speaks truth to some when he says that renunciation of further testing or of the weapons themselves will open the door to aggression. Too few persons make the distinction between the scientist and the military or political theoretician—and this is a distinction we must make.

Indeed the whole attitude which regards warlike measures as moral, under the present circumstances, is reprehensible. Teller frequently mentions in his

articles that we should clean up our nuclear weapons so that innocent bystanders will not be harmed. Who is an innocent bystander in today's world? So far as I am concerned all mankind shares the responsibility for war, and for preventing it, and to kill combatants or noncombatants is equally immoral. The recurring manner in which Teller slides over the basic immorality of war in his articles creates in many minds a like attitude. This is the feeling that if the scientist who has so much moral prestige is not concerned about the morality of the arms race, then no one else should bother themselves about it either.

In a recent speech at the University of Minnesota, Dr. Harrison Brown, geochemist at California Institute of Technology, had this to say:

In Dr. Teller's world of the future, the world of the armed peace, the brush-fire war and the do-it-yourself air-raid shelter, the people of the United States will be driven steadily toward increased organization, increased conformity, and increased control over the thoughts and actions of the individual. In the face of the powerful modern tools of persuasion and coercion I fear that what dignity and freedom we still possess may one day vanish.

I sense that Harrison Brown feels like many of us feel sometimes, that there is a wholesale paralysis of the moral sensibilities among not only the public citizenry in general, but among responsible persons of all types in particular.

Perhaps Teller fears he will become a heretic if he does not support the popular course of military armament. On the other hand, it seems to me that J. Robert Oppenheimer represents the mature scientist who is unafraid of making a mistake and who has embraced—or seeks to discover—an integrating philosophy of life based on scientific method. Oppenheimer is not fearful of considering other alternatives besides that of military preparation. He does not seem to be searching for certainty. He seems rather to be satisfied to choose a longer range course of action, and not to fear Russia in a way that is blinding or paralyzing to choice or thought. If we turn again to Lippmann's book there are a few remarks on the character of the mature man which throw contrasting light on these two scientists. Lippmann says:

... so the mature man would take the world as it comes and within himself remain quite unperturbed. When he acted he would know that he was only testing [an idea], and if he failed, he would know that he

had made a mistake. He would be quite prepared for the discovery that he might make mistakes, for his intelligence would be disentangled from his hopes. . . . It would be no effort for him to be tolerant, and no annoyance to be skeptical. . . . Fear would not haunt him, for he would be without compulsion to seize anything.

Oppenheimer manifests these characteristics, particularly in his book, *Science and the Common Understanding*, and in other of his published lectures.

In the same issue (January) of *Foreign Affairs*, Robert Oppenheimer writes an article titled "An Inward Look" which has elements of a sermon about it. In this article Oppenheimer casts the whole struggle between the Soviets and the United States in the larger, wider role in which I believe it belongs: the moral, ethical struggle between two vital but different ways of life. His thesis is that this is not a struggle we can resolve by renewed educational efforts but that the things that bother us are indicative of a deep and unprecedented cultural crisis which "will not yield to symptomatic therapy but to changes in our life, what we believe, what we do, and what we value." The task we face is not to arm to the teeth, but to resolve the problems arising from the fact that we have ". . . no

unifying theory about what life is about; there is no consensus either as to the nature of reality or the part we play in it; there is no theory of the good life and not much theory of the role of the government in promoting it." Confronted with this spiritually troubling situation we face the "terrible temptation to seek for the key that is not there, the simple summary from which all else will follow." Oppenheimer adds that while the cold war is real and bitter, "it is not the only issue in the world, and for countless other people, and their governments it is not the issue they see in the broadest, harshest light." In the very breadth and depth of thought that is represented by Oppenheimer we are more likely to find the solution to our many besetting problems. A new integration and unification of human life and knowledge within each personality is far more likely to take place if we accept the more open and fluid vision of Oppenheimer, rather than Teller's more rigid and fear-ridden views.

In conclusion I quote from the final paragraph of Oppenheimer's article, "An Inward Look":

What we here need is a vastly greater intellectual vigor and discipline; a more habitual and widespread openmindedness; and a kind of indefatigability which is not inconsistent with

fatigue but is inconsistent with surrender. It is not that our land is poor in curiosity, true learning, in the habit of smelling out one's own self-delusion, in the dedication and search for order and law. . . .

there is respect for learning and expertness, and a proper recognition. . . . of our limits. . . . but of none of these is there enough. . . . if indeed government by the people is not to perish.

Apartment Glamour Girl

ETHEL S. BEER



GAIN and again Bambi sang, "Me bootiful, me bootiful," as she strutted along the street, proud as a peacock in her new flaming red snowsuit and hood trimmed with brown.

"The lady said you're beautiful," gently corrected her mother, an attractive young woman in her thirties, whom the little girl closely resembled. Laughter changed the faraway anxious expression in her large blue eyes as she gazed at her child affectionately.

Sensing her mother's love rather than the reproach, two-year-old Bambi continued the refrain, much to the amusement of the passers-by, who nodded assent. Nobody could deny that this brightly clad small miss with her sunny smile, blond hair, and sparkling blue eyes looked lovely. No wonder she is called "glamour

girl" by one of the elevator men in the apartment where she lives.

"Hello lady, hello man," Bambi greets strangers, peering up into each face and confidently waiting for a reply. Sometimes she is even more friendly. One day in a bus, she clambered down from a seat beside her mother and sauntered to the front. Then she amazed the other passengers by saying, "God bless you," to a man, who had just sneezed. A little later when he did it again, she repeated the performance.

Ask Bambi who she is and her response is likely to be: "I'm 'Dim's' blondie." Jim—which she pronounces Dim—is her godfather and she is very fond of him. However, at times as though afraid that her mother will feel slighted and disappear, as happens all too frequently, she answers: "I'm Mummie's blondie."

Bambi's mother, like many others, has to be away all day because she has a job. This is hard on both of them, particularly as there are such inadequate facilities for the children of working mothers in this country, and practically none for Bambi's age group in New York City where she lives. Thus mothers forced into the labor market have a double problem, separation from their children and finding a place to leave them. Relatively few households today include extra relatives. Domestic help is expensive. Yet although many more mothers work now than in the past, the public refuses to recognize the plight of their children. Otherwise the Day Nursery would not be as restricted as it is at present.

Formerly the Day Nursery was the refuge of the children of working mothers from babyhood until the middle teens. In a sense it was a second home, which is what these children need. But today its emphasis is on preschool education rather than the social problem, created by mothers being away from the children for such long hours year after year. With rare exceptions babies under two are excluded from Day Nurseries in the United States, while in some places—such as New York City—the regular age for admission is three years. Not all Day Nurseries accept school children

either. Bambi's mother is only one of the many on the spot in regard to the care of their children, whom they must support. She is also typical of the new group, that requires the aid of the Day Nursery. Bambi's mother belongs to the office world, not the factory.

Like most two-year-olds Bambi lets her tiny but strong hands stray everywhere. Daintily she picks up ornament after ornament to examine. Then she turns to investigate the contents of a drawer, insisting if anyone tries to stop her, "I find something nice here, me."

Pocketbooks are especially intriguing. Skillfully Bambi opens the clasp in spite of her mother's reprimands. In a trice she has lipstick and compact out, not to mention the paper bills, which she gleefully holds up for inspection.

"See, Mummy, money," says she.

But usually Bambi is quite content to replace all shortly or permit her mother to do so. Bambi is an easy child to manage, undoubtedly because her mother reasons with her so much.

Of course, Bambi likes to imitate her mother, the mainstay of her existence. Recently, the mother who is a secretary was doing some work at home. Leaving the typewriter a few minutes she returned to find Bambi with her wee fingers poised on the keys. To interrupt

her was another matter.

"Go 'way Mummy, I'm working," she ordered glibly.

Watching Bambi with her cute ways it is hard to realize that tragedy lurks in the background. She is one of the many children in this country growing up in a lopsided household. Bambi's mother is bringing her up alone. She has the complete custody of her daughter, which entails considerable responsibility. Her husband, who left before the baby was born and has never seen her, contributes only a small amount monthly. The mother's father, living in another city, gives nothing regularly. Bambi's mother has nobody on whom she can depend. Raising a child without a father is difficult in any case, and particularly so when the mother must work.

During the last four years Bambi's mother has gone through a veritable gamut of emotional experiences. Her mother, to whom she was devoted, died. Afterwards she stayed with her father, who had been divorced from her mother when she was a child. The adjustment was hard and she was unhappy in the city where he lived. Marriage to a man in service brought her back to New York upon his discharge. At about the same time her father embarked on his fourth matrimonial venture. Bambi's arrival, which was

a real joy to her mother, was followed by divorce. But as the mother had to continue working the baby had to be boarded out—a discouraging arrangement.

"It was work, work, work, for my baby," Bambi's mother says now. "And still I had so little of her."

Such a reaction is natural for any mother, who must send her child away. Yet social agencies place babies in foster homes because the Day Nursery will not take them. To be sure, aid to dependent children is given more freely now than before. Only a few mothers like Bambi's are willing to accept it even if they are eligible, preferring their own independence. Neither can they wait two or three years for the assistance of the Day Nursery.

When Bambi was less than a year her mother took a bold step. She brought her baby home to a one-room apartment. Fortunately the Superintendent's wife—a soft-spoken kindly woman with no children of her own—consented to care for her. Seeing her baby at night and during the week end did make up to some extent for the steady grind of business. Not that such sharing is altogether ideal. A small child is likely to get confused when somebody else takes the place of the mother for so much of the time. However, no other solution was possible

under the circumstances.

Because their living quarters were so crowded, Bambi and her mother moved to another apartment in the same building, as soon as one was available. Although the added expense was not easy to meet for the already overpressed mother, the change was worth-while from every other angle. Now Bambi has a room of her own, as she should, which she shows off proudly to visitors exclaiming:

"Look my new house, me."

Bambi is a sociable youngster, very trustful of people. Somehow her mother has succeeded in building up a sense of security. She has an ease of manner, rarely encountered in a two-year-old, as evidenced by the way she welcomes guests to her home.

"Take off your coat, please," is her usual greeting.

Short sentences do not baffle Bambi. There is hardly a word of ordinary conversation that she does not understand and try to repeat. She speaks very distinctly, doubtless because her mother never uses "baby talk." She also walked early. Because Bambi is so advanced in her development, she seems older than she is. Perhaps, too, her resourcefulness is due to the different adjustments she has had to make. Her world is full of many adults in the apartment, all eager to help her and her mother.

Bambi is a born mimic, a phase that her mother does not discourage by teasing. At the sound of the bell she runs to the door and calls:

"Is Mr. Bryant in?", just as the tenants do when they come to the Superintendent's apartment seeking him.

Bambi and her mother have great fun together. They play like two children, starting with "horsy" in bed. Naturally there is not much time for this game during the week when the mother has to rush to the office every morning. However, it became a real ritual recently when the mother was unemployed for awhile. Taking care of her own child all the time would have been sheer pleasure for Bambi's mother, had she not had to worry about the havoc caused to her always hard-to-stretch budget. As for Bambi she was blissful. In fact, when the mother returned to work, her small daughter was so cross at her that she refused to kiss her upon her return each evening. Not that this prevented Bambi from loyally telling others during the day:

"Mummy works, mummy works," as though to defend her seeming desertion.

During week ends Bambi is inclined to follow her mother like a shadow, maybe to be sure that she will stay. Also, she demands a

great deal of attention, apparently trying to make up for lost time. Her behavior varies to gain this end. She balks at eating, playing with her food. One day when her mother's back was turned she sprinkled the plants with orange juice. Again she hides different objects, ranging from table silver to her mother's gloves, vaguely sensing perhaps that the latter are needed to go to the office. There is no telling what Bambi will do next. Like all children she has many ways of showing that she misses her mother, which grown-ups too often regard as stubbornness or naughtiness.

Probably Bambi would be less lonesome for her mother if she had the companionship of other children. But since no Day Nursery will take her as yet, the mother has no choice. Actually, Bambi does not seem unhappy with the Superintendent's wife, which is understandable as she and her husband treat her like their own child. Their two dogs are her boon companions, particularly the younger, a puppy called Troubles, just acquired. Bambi thinks of all kinds of things to do with them. One day she started to pour sleeping pills down the throat of Skippy, the older dog, who luckily was rescued in time. On another occasion she dressed the puppy up:

"See Troubles has me pants on,"

she said pointing and giggling when the Superintendent caught her in the act.

Bambi is the pet of the apartment house staff, all of whom she knows by name. However to her the Superintendent is "Pampie Sweetheart," which she usually shortens to "Pampie." What this means only Bambi knows. If one of the elevator men hears her cry he stops to investigate the reason. Bambi will never be neglected as long as she remains in this building, a fact her mother realizes and appreciates.

Bambi has many friends among the tenants, too. Occasionally one or the other borrows her. Once she stayed overnight with an elderly couple using their grandson's crib and high chair. By morning she was so at home that she adopted them for grandparents.

Often she asks to go to my apartment, a few floors above hers. Standing at her own door she pleads:

"Nice toys, nice toys, go uptown, me."

When there she will play with the toys for awhile, especially if I join in. Then she wanders about, generally ending up in the bathroom. Washing her hands is a special treat, maybe because she can reach the sink by moving the laundry hamper in front to stand on. A miniature cake of soap and

tiny nail brush add to her enjoyment. Nor does she touch any other. Dangling her hands in the water, turning on the faucets, pushing down the stopper, and otherwise dawdling amuse her indefinitely. Once finished, Bambi turns to me and asks:

"Towel please Missee Beer, towel please, me?"

Such is the story of Bambi, the apartment glamour girl, unique only because of her rare charm. All over the country mothers are facing the same problem. The group has enlarged not only numerically but in range of occupation. No longer is it predominated by the ignorant mother, earning the lowest salary. Today working mothers include those in factories, the office, department stores, and other lines of business. Even the professional woman is not always in search of a career. Nurses, teachers, social workers, and so forth, often have to support their children. The War, which widowed many; unhappiness leading to separation and divorce; the high cost of living today; all are reasons that force mothers to make money. Striving against odds to maintain a home for their children, these women have unlimited courage, especially if—like Bambi's mother—they have no mate and no close relative to rely on.

Yet society refuses to recognize their claim for assistance. The Day Nursery—traditionally dedicated to the children of working mothers—too frequently is confined to the preschool group at present in this country. The facilities for school boys and girls are very inadequate. As for babies practically no Day Nursery will take them. In this respect the picture is quite different in Europe. France and Italy have splendid Day Nurseries for babies up to three, England extends the age to five years. Since apparently these nations deal with babies effectively, it seems as though the United States could, too. But even at the preschool level our Day Nurseries pay the most attention to education and do not always include the intimate care that the children of working mothers need. Probably if the staff had special training, as they do in England, this condition would be remedied. At any rate, if the Day Nursery fulfilled its function, children like Bambi would not be excluded. As it is, her mother was lucky to find the solution that she did.

Nevertheless Bambi is a symbol of countless forgotten children, whose mothers must hold down a job. And in spite of all the alleged interest in the generation growing up in our rich land, these youngsters are woefully neglected.

Sputnik's Questions

STEWART MEACHAM

UNIVAC, the electronic brain, and Sputnik, the man-made satellite, come from opposite sides of the Iron Curtain, but they have much in common. Both represent great technological achievement. Both are portents of change in human society.

Univac promises the automation age, when factories, offices, and transportation systems, staffed only by a few skilled technicians, will operate by push button. Sputnik promises the outer space age, when space platforms, trips to the moon, journeys to Mars, and no one knows what else, will be commonplace. Univac answers the most difficult questions at lightning speed. Sputnik asks the most difficult questions at 18,000 miles per hour.

Some of Sputnik's more obvious questions reflect our own frustration. Why did Russia "beat us to the punch"? Was it because of rivalry among the armed forces? Is this the price we must pay for belittling and harassing scientists as eggheads and subversives? Is more money needed for research and experimentation? How much political hay will the Democrats make at the expense of the Re-

publicans, and vice versa?

Other questions are less obvious, but possibly more important. We are told that we must be prepared for economic sacrifice and belt-tightening if we are to "catch up." If this is true, who will sacrifice what? Will airplane, rocket, and munitions makers sacrifice some of their cost-plus profit margins? Will the steel industry, the automobile manufacturers, the appliance companies, and the food processors sacrifice their skyrocketing prices? Will the oil companies sacrifice their special tax concessions? Will the loan companies and the banks sacrifice their recent rate increases on mortgages?

Or is the sacrificing all to come from the working people, some of whom already are being forced to sacrifice jobs and savings until new defense appropriations are made, or rockets replace aircraft on the assembly lines, and they are rescued from the ranks of the unemployed? Or is the sacrificing to be done by the people with fixed incomes whose small salaries and pensions shrink as prices spiral upward?

What about diplomacy and our friends overseas? Will winning the race to the moon solve Asia's eco-

conomic problems? Will it feed Pakistan's landless villagers? Will it build hydro-electric dams in India? Will it bring self-government to the people of Kenya or the Belgian Congo? Will it end the terror in Algeria? Will it solve the question of Middle East oil? Will it set the slaves of Saudi Arabia free, bring free trade unions to Spain, protect freedom of press in Formosa, or provide security from the police to the legislators of South Korea? Just who will be remembered and who forgotten as we race Russia into outer space?

During the days of our supposed preëminence in weapons, we felt that our "position of strength" made diplomacy unimportant. We became masters of "brinkmanship" which is another word for bluff and bluster with a loaded gun. Today, in the period of our supposed deficiency in weapons (it would take us all of three hours to wipe out every city

in Russia!) our "position of weakness" makes diplomacy impossible. We must play it tough until we can catch up.

At this rate when does diplomacy become possible? One day we are so strong we do not have to bargain. The next day we are so weak we cannot afford to. Where does this process lead?

And what about that troublesome word "morals"? What kind of morality is it where right and wrong are decided by the fastest rockets and the biggest warheads? If this is morality, what is immorality?

These are Sputnik's questions. But Sputnik, a man-made thing, can do no more than pose them, fling them far out into space and fly on. The answers must come from man himself, reached in terms of faith in God and belief in humanity and justice, which alone can provide the freedom and security for which the people of the world are hungry today.

"Those who should be foremost in courageous thinking, those who have had all the so-called advantages of education, our college and university alumni, are with rarest exceptions little enough interested in daring thought. For the most part they have been so conditioned that in the presence of unfamiliar ideas they are cautious."

Porter Sargent.

Who Was Jesus, Anyhow?*

JOHN M. MORRIS



FEW months ago, I got a book called *Fix Your Plymouth*. It told how to do simple repair jobs on the family car. With the book in one hand and a screwdriver in the other, I was able to put new points in the distributor and actually get the motor to run again after I was through.

I've always needed a book like this. We didn't have hot rods during the war, when I was in high school, and automobile repairing was not then thought to be a suitable course of study for students. But, by reading my book, I was able to learn all about car repairing.

The Bible is just the opposite. The more scholars pour over it, comparing notes and asking questions, the less they seem to know about its subjects. Particularly about the person Christians believe to be the principal subject of the Bible, Jesus of Nazareth. The clear-cut Jesus of the Sunday School, the noble figure of the Passion Play, the baby Jesus of Christmastime, all fade into the shadows of enigma when we begin seriously to study the

best biographies that we have of him, the four gospels of the Bible.

The study of the life of Jesus may seem at first to be remote from the primary interests of Unitarians. For us, the precise details of his life are not as important as the ideas associated with him. It does not really matter whether Jesus actually preached the Sermon on the Mount, or whether, as most scholars believe, the supposed sermon is simply a collection of wise sayings gathered by an early Christian. If these sayings seem to ring a bell inside us, if they open up new areas of thought and experience, if they set a challenge for us—then, we say, they are sacred scripture no matter who said them. If we cannot respond to them, then they are worthless to us, no matter who their author was.

Why then should we spend more than a minimum of time attempting to reconstruct the true life of Jesus? Because we are one of the religious communities on this earth that is wholly committed to the truth. The truth that may be frightening or difficult, the truth that may throw over all the ideas that seemed so grand to us yesterday; but the truth that in the

*An address delivered at the Unitarian Church of Quincy, Illinois.

end can make us free.

We look at the Bible as one area of human concern. It has been an inspiration and guide for men for generations, and that should concern us. But we should notice it, too, because no other area is more likely to be filled with mythology, mistakes, and mumbo jumbo.

I might have called this address "Changing Fashions in the Life of Jesus." Each generation has taken the materials about Jesus and molded them to fit its own image. Just as the psychologist's client looks at a set of pictures and tells stories about them—thereby learning more about his own personality—so also have the various incidents in the Gospels been interpreted in terms that reveal the personality of the interpreter.

The life of Jesus in the Gospels leaves hundreds of questions unanswered. Here are some of the more probing ones:

What, precisely, was the relationship between Jesus and Joseph? Did King Herod really try to kill the child? Did the family have to run away to Egypt?

Did other people recognize how great he was as he was growing up? Did he take some course of "esoteric" study from great wise men, or did he simply grow up like any other Jewish boy of his time? When John baptized Jesus in the river, did he recognize him

as someone special?

How did Jesus think of himself? What did he mean by "The Kingdom of God"? How should we interpret his saying that we should love our enemies.

When Jesus spoke, as he did, of demons, did he really believe in them himself, or was he just "talking down" to the common people? Did he really believe that the world would soon come to an end?

How are we to understand the story of his trial and resurrection?

These and a thousand other questions have provoked whole libraries of scholarly books; yet the questions keep coming up. The way that each generation answers them gives the current fashion in the life of Jesus; each generation projects into that life the hopes, fears, ideas, and beliefs of its time. Yet all is not subjectivity and speculation; we have learned to become more objective about Jesus. Particularly since the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls, we believe that there is the basis for a new and more accurate picture of Jesus, which I want to mention in a few minutes.

The first fashion in the life of Jesus, one that is still alive today, is that of the *supernatural savior*. His message was salvation. It would be too simple to say that the only meaning of "salvation" is saving men from death; salvation

is a deeper and more important concept than that. It means a reconciliation between man and God; it means a cleansing of the soul or psyche or spirit so that it may become worthy of its place in the eternal scheme of things. In the salvation story, Jesus became the symbol of the union of human and divine; he bridged the gap between man and God.

With such a conception of Jesus, it was natural for men to emphasize and perhaps exaggerate the miraculous element in Jesus' life. He had to show that he was something more than human, that the divine was in him. To ordinary people, the most obvious proof that he could give was to work extraordinary feats of magic. The supernatural savior is the miracle worker. The important events in his life are the proofs that he gives of his divinity. The virgin birth, the voices from the clouds (saying "This is my beloved son"), the healing and curing, the feeding of the multitude—and all climaxed by the resurrection from the dead. These are the important elements in the life of Jesus the supernatural savior.

Many today have lost contact with this conception of Jesus. Our horizons have broadened enough to see that there have been many men in history for whom such miracles have been claimed. Such "miracles" seem to be the product

of another kind of world-view than the one we share today. We cannot *prove* that the miracles of Jesus did not take place, any more than we can *prove* that the miracles of Buddha or Mohammed or Krishna did not take place. Yet we find it impossible to believe these "miracles" when we believe in the greater miracles of birth and life and death, the miracles of the stars and atoms, the miracles of human thought and human love.

Let us not condemn this picture of a supernatural Jesus, though, any more than we condemn the similar pictures of Buddha or Mohammed. Men need the feeling of salvation. For a person who does not feel himself an alien in this world, who needs the sense that God approves of him and accepts him, such a belief may be a source of strength.

The attempt to construct a picture of Jesus without the elements of supernaturalism produced our second fashion in the life of Jesus: *Jesus as teacher*.

Thomas Jefferson believed that you could tell by instinct what were the true teachings of Jesus, and what were later additions, added on, as he thought, by priests and superstitious persons. He compared the words of Jesus and the surroundings to "diamonds in a dunghill." He set out to separate these gems from their offensive en-

vironment in the little book that he called *The Life and Morals of Jesus of Nazareth*. Jefferson eliminated all the supernatural elements, all the miracles. In contrast to the supernatural savior, Jefferson's Jesus is a man who taught love and friendship for all people and love for God.

Jefferson, of course, was not the only person to try to reconstruct the life of Jesus along these lines. Perhaps the greatest effect of this fashion in biography was the production of what we call the "social gospel." This is the conscious attempt to apply the teachings of Jesus to the pressing social problems of the day. Jesus taught love, peace, and reconciliation among men; we must therefore work to bring these about in the social order, we must work to build the Kingdom of God on earth.

This second version of the life of Jesus is not dead. Our world would be in worse shape than it is if there were not many sincere Christians who try to apply the teachings of Jesus to the world's problems.

Liberals have been sorry to see this picture of Jesus fall out of fashion, because it has been vitally important to us. Yet we must admit that it falls short of telling the whole truth about Jesus. For, as Albert Schweitzer and many others have insisted, Jesus preached an *eschatology*, a doctrine of the end

of the world. Try as we may, we cannot escape the fact that Jesus believed that the world was coming to an end very soon, and that the Kingdom of God is not a Utopia, but a mysterious and other-worldly sort of kingdom that we cannot fully understand.

As Schweitzer says, there is nothing wrong with Jesus for believing as he did. He is not a "crackpot." The whole Jewish world was confidently expecting the Day of the Lord, when God's Messiah would appear to drive the Romans into the sea. Jesus may actually have thought that he himself was the Messiah, and Schweitzer attempts to prove that he did.

This Jesus, the eschatological Jesus, might not have conflicted with the liberal Jesus. After all, he might have been mistaken about the end of the world and still been very right in his teaching that men should love one another. But, and this was the important but, he could not possibly have been planning to set up a permanent community of men on this earth. You simply do not think in terms of a permanent, practical social system when you also think that the world is going to come to an end tomorrow. You think rather of purifying yourself, getting ready for the great event, repenting of your sins (or committing bigger and better ones), selling your lands, and so on. The

world for Jesus was like the day before Christmas—full of excitement and urgency, but strictly temporary.

We must not forget, as I said earlier, that the teachings of Jesus stand or fall on their own merit. If he taught men to love their enemies, and if this kind of life is worth-while, then it does not matter whether Jesus thought it would last for only a day. But if we are interested in reconstructing a true portrait of the Jesus of history, then we must admit that he was hopelessly hog-tied by his belief that the Messiah was coming and that we must prepare ourselves for the advent.

Through this interpretation, Jesus becomes a man of his own time, a Jew in the Palestine of two thousand years ago. And by the same token, he is taken out of our time. We cannot derive a way of life from his sayings, because his way of life applied primarily to a very different world from ours.

This third picture is farther from us than the two that preceded it. We know less about this Jesus than we thought we did about the first two, because his mind is filled with thoughts that we do not completely understand.

The fourth Jesus is still farther from us. I can only begin to hint at what this fourth Jesus is like, because scholars have not even begun to arrive at conclusions

about him. A. Powell Davies, minister of our Washington, D. C., church, before his death was at work on a portrait of him. Dr. Davies' book on Paul the Apostle, *The First Christian* (Farrar, Strauss & Cudahy, \$4.50), contains a chapter on this new conception of Jesus. It is, admittedly, the most controversial chapter in the book.

Dr. Davies believed, to put it baldly, that there were at least two Jesuses. He found evidence, not only from the Dead Sea Scrolls, but from many other ancient sources, that there was a "Jesus" who was put to death about a century before Jesus of Nazareth was born.

We have always known that the name "Jesus Christ" was not a man's given name, but a title. "Christ" is simply a Greek word meaning "anointed," as a king is anointed at his coronation by pouring oil over his head. It is a translation of the Hebrew word "Messiah," which has the same meaning. "Jesus," Dr. Davies suggested, may simply have been a title meaning "savior"—since it comes from the Hebrew name Jeshua, meaning "the Lord will save." "Jesus Christ" thus means simply "Savior King."

The earlier Jesus is the Teacher of Righteousness, mentioned so often in the Dead Sea Scrolls, who was put to death by the Wicked Priest. Other early Jewish writings

suggest that it was he, and not the Jesus of the Gospels, that went to Egypt. He seems to have been called a "Nazerian"—this was a Dead Sea monastic order—and this word has often been confused with the word "Nazarene," which is the name used by Jesus' followers and which comes from the name of Jesus' supposed home, Nazareth. The followers of the earlier Jesus were often called followers of Chrestos, the righteous one, a name which could easily be changed to Christos, the anointed one.

And so the fascinating speculation goes. The followers of the later Jesus take over the organization left by the followers of the earlier one. As they grow stronger, the earlier Jesus is partly forgotten, partly assimilated to the later Jesus. Then, as the Christian church becomes dominant, it burns wagonload after wagonload of documents which may have referred to the earlier Jesus. And, in the end, he is only a memory.

As Dr. Davies said, all this is no more than a guess; but it does show how extremely this is the evidence supporting the traditional picture of Jesus. We cannot know much about this new Jesus. How can we speak of knowing "the mind of Jesus" when we don't know whether we're talking about one man or two?

Whether, when more evidence comes in, we will want to support Dr. Davies' view, or whether we must dismiss it as unproved, we must admit once again that we know less about Jesus than we thought we did. Or, to put it another way, we find further evidence that man must find his guidance for himself. He may listen to the teachings attributed to Jesus, to Moses, to Buddha, but his final authority is himself (whatever that difficult word self may mean).

There are countless variations on each of the four portraits of Jesus that I have suggested to you. Jesus the supernatural savior, Jesus the simple teacher and prophet of a new world order, Jesus the man who thought that the world was coming to an end, Jesus the enigmatic reincarnation of the martyred Teacher of Righteousness—each of these four has provided the material for countless debates.

Yet the time must come for each person to stop the debate, close the book, and leave it behind. A time when he must say to himself, "All right, I'm supposed to love my neighbor, do good to those that harm me, build the kingdom of God. This sounds good to me. I don't care who said it. The thing for me is to start doing it now, here, today."

BOOKMAN'S NOTEBOOK

CHARLES W. PHILLIPS

TO THE CULTURED DESPISERS OF RELIGION

The name of Friedrich Schleiermacher has started to come to the fore a bit recently. At least we shall mention three instances of it in our experience: It was prominent at the I.A.R.F. meetings in Chicago last summer in the presentations of Wilhelm Pauck and Friedrich Heiler. Pauck quoted Schleiermacher to the end that if Christianity did not liberalize "faith would become allied with superstition, and science with unbelief." He further commended the "Father of Modern Theology" for making theology a descriptive, historical science. Heiler took a strong stand on Schleiermacher by name, against Barth and Kraemer whose ideas of the absoluteness of Christianity he said were making a "disaster" on the mission field. Then one of Tillich's editors told us that Tillich had admitted a kinship between himself and the earlier German preacher-theologian, and we heard Tillich described recently in still other circles as a kind of modern-day preacher to the "cultured despisers."

The *Speeches to the Cultured Despisers of Religion*, by Schleiermacher, has just been published by Harper's Torchbooks in good paperback at \$1.25. The author was an obscure hospital chaplain in Berlin at the time, in 1800. It was, and still is, a great work. His great systematic theology, the

Christian Faith, was to come out some years later, but the germ ideas are all here and, often, more felicitously stated. This book is a good buy, and has a lot of value for liberals today. One root of that comes from the motives and circumstances implied in the title. Cultivated, and even cultured, people were disposed to be contemptuous of "religion" or bored, or felt an essential irrelevance to it. Schleiermacher was himself no bluenose and could find his place with the *bons vivants*. He appreciated the poets and artists he consorted with, and was as cosmopolitan and cultured as any, and more than most. He was also nurtured in the Pietist tradition and was a deeply religious man. He took his friends at face value. He appealed to them through their intelligence and their esthetic sensibilities. Where they had criticisms of religion which were valid, he admitted it, and often stated the point with greater clarity. Then he made the case for a genuine, authentic religion. Religion has its own independence, he argued, and cannot be equated with, or deduced from, esthetics or science, or "ethics." He has the highest respect for all of them. He is himself an esthete, but an independent experience of religiousness is necessary to give sinew to it. He nowhere demeans science or reason, but he will be no mechanist or easy rationalist. He believes profoundly in the works

of ethics but he is not duty-ridden. When he describes the religious sense as primarily a "feeling" it is not the best possible word (he uses the word "piety" as synonymous with "religion," too, and thereby makes somewhat of an idiomatic block for us to crawl over) but the context will surely exonerate him from the charge of simple emotionalism. He is nowhere simpleminded. In an area where no words have too much normative value or descriptive accuracy, his phrase defining religion as "the sense and taste for the infinite" is as germinative as any.

In any case, his is a powerful argument for authenticity in religion, for religion within the boundaries of experience. He is very reminiscent of much in our own tradition—of the charge Emerson made in the Divinity School Address and of that gentleman's castigation of the "corpse-cold Unitarianism of Harvard College and Brattle St." Parker echoed the same thing. Just because he is reminiscent, however, he is a good supplement to our tradition, and may even be the means of helping some of us to rediscover that tradition. He is useful another way. He is a link to the main body of Christendom from which we are heavily estranged and getting more so. It is partly forced upon us, and partly chosen (although just how much our choice is the response of quitting in face of a threat of being fired is not yet altogether clear, in spite of our positive, praiseworthy motives to give equality of right in our membership to other religions). Personally, we do not care whether

you would find Schleiermacher just polemically useful in critical defense of our drift, or whether you are one of the ones who somewhat deplore the drift on either of two counts: (1) that we ought to have more connections, or (2) that if the main-line orthodox bodies cannot liberalize a bit more, they will go down the drain, but in the debacle we'll get badly hurt, too, and should therefore, for cultural reasons, remonstrate where we can through their tradition. In either case, Schleiermacher is a most useful man.

He is important in his own right, however, and stimulating and provocative. Not all of his idiom has to be translated. In fact not too much. Yet he is good for the "cultured despisers."

A reverse twist on the "cultured despisers" theme is given in another new book by Doubleday: *The Democratic Vista*, by Richard Chase (\$3.95). The title is obviously from Walt Whitman. The author is a literary and culture critic, is an avowed "liberal" and does not deal with religion much. The aforementioned "twist" is twofold: (1) he is trying to reassert liberalism against the cultured despisers of the age of "Eisenhower conformity" and (2) is himself obviously a cultured despiser of religion. These oddities would excite interest. Coupled with his obviously high intelligence and perceptiveness, it is very good reading, even though for our money he raises more questions than he answers. (We preached a sermon on this, sent author Chase a copy, and got a friendly reply saying that that is what most of his critics said.)

Chase essays the same task of trying to combat conformist groupism that Whyte did in *The Organization Man*, but confines himself to cultural history, and what is in the national psychology which is letting us in for this. He finds us going back on the best of our literary and artistic tradition from the beginning. With much use of that tradition (he is also author of the brilliant *Tradition of the American Novel*, Doubleday Anchor \$.95) he also draws much upon Emerson. In much of it, it is a good job of disentangling "liberalism" from both left and right. He can be really astringent on the pseudo-liberalism of the left, noting a certain kind of liberal to be reflecting merely "the neurotic stresses and hidden aggression of the disaffected members of the middle class." On the other hand, he dismantles also or makes sharp sallies against the "myth cultists" today. The book is short, and cast in a dialogue form of writing, is more of an impressionistic piece than one of sustained, analytical development.

For all it has a lot of sharpness and usefulness, he fails to make a fully adequate statement of liberalism to us. For one thing, he fails to handle the sex motif. He introduces a Dionysian character, Maggie, and has obviously a high regard for the possibility of the libido being linked with intelligence. He gets very ambivalent though. He obviously likes Maggie, even though he admits that "there is nothing sustained and cumulative about her," and in the end can't make anything of it except to get her into bed with Renaldo, a young, optimistic, ex-

patriate European who feels confident about wedding culture to technology. (This is only alluded to—nothing juicy here.)

That failure can be overlooked. In a short book these episodes could have been left out, since there is no resolution in them, and the rest would stand, save for a greater defect to us. This lies in his treatment of religion. In one sense, he intends to by-pass it, and says so in the Foreword. Such comments as creep in are mostly invidious when he is dealing with George (the Eisenhower conformist—although an awfully cultivated fellow) and his intention to join a church ("probably an Episcopalian church"). Yet, when he seeks a secular standard of value in the literary tradition, he finds it entirely in religious Puritanism, and its "Manichean" (the word is his) sense of the tension between good and evil, light and dark, and general dualism which cannot be resolved, but only fought. Whyte, you will remember, also sought to retrieve the Puritan-Protestant ethic. Whyte, however, in alluding more to a recovery of the Puritan's ramrod character and sense of inner-direction, suited us a little better than this return to Zoroastrianism via the Puritans. Although used much in the text, surely there is some distinction between Emerson and this trend. No doubt we have beaten the Puritans over the head too much. We always enjoyed as a positive *bon mot* instead of the negative one intended, the description of Adlai Stevenson in 1952, as a "left-wing Puritan." Yet, neither honesty nor insight requires us to resurrect Jonathan Edwards, either.

Chase is a liberal who is a "cultured despiser of religion" but in his confusions about "liberalism" and about "religion" he may expose some gaping chinks in what both mean for some of the rest of us. He is sensitive and acute. We have found ourselves several times seeming to attack the book more than praise it. In spite of the fact that he raises more issues than he settles, we would highly recommend it.

The fall publishing of both Harper's Torchbooks and Meridian is very good. We'll come to more of both next time. It does not need reviewing at this late date, but Harper's Torchbooks has a good two-volume edition in paperback of the wonderful Burckhardt *Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy*. It has this innovation: the pictures are related to the text throughout, instead of being stacked at the end. At least one of our deep roots is in the humanism of the Renaissance, and this is a cheap way to acquire and read a classic.

The fall series of Beacon is

extraordinarily good. Two books, although small and in hardback at \$3.95 apiece are superb. One is a symposium on *Science and Religion*, edited by Horton. There are nine essays, including Philip Frank, and P. Bridgman (in whose retirement-honor the volume is published), J. Robert Oppenheimer, Howard Mumford Jones, and others. The only essay dull to us is by Charles Morris; and Giorgio de Santillana's is brilliant. We'll have more to say on this, but are inclined to induce a reading now by expressing unqualified enthusiasm. The same goes for John Herman Randall's *The Role of Knowledge in Western Religion*. Compact, clear, with tremendous generalizations which are yet acute, he surveys the West from the Greeks to the present. He brings it up to right now; and, after a fine analysis of the limitations of knowledge, ends on a great apology for natural theology. These two books will be a good long drink of cold water on a hot day, to the liberal interested in giving intellectual substance, with clarity, to our aphorisms.

"The citadel of human ignorance does not succumb to direct assault. The growing consciousness of man, his awareness to the world about him, is more readily accelerated by strategic infiltration from many directions and at unsuspected moments."

Porter Sargent.



Western Unitarian Conference

700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago 53, Illinois

ELLSWORTH M. SMITH, *Executive Secretary*

During the fall, so far, the Annual Meetings of seven of our eight Area Conferences have been held. In general the pattern is developing as follows: each Area Conference selects a member of the Western Conference Nominating Committee and suggests people who may be nominated to the Board of Directors; each Area selects members of the Western Conference Program-Planning Committee and the Committee on Fellowships; the Western Conference Religious Education Committee is now directly representative of seven of the eight Areas.

By and large, each Area Conference has an Executive Committee, a Fellowships Committee, a Religious Education Committee and, in a beginning way, an Extension Committee.

Twenty-two people were trained at Lake Geneva by Munroe Husbands in the art of starting and servicing fellowships. These people are now visiting fellowships and picking communities for new tries.

Twenty-nine of our member societies are having field work visits in the field of religious education by Frances Wood. In cooperation with the Council of Liberal Churches and with Frances Wood as instructor, eight of our religious education people have been especially trained and are now beginning to give extended field work services to seventeen

other churches and fellowships.

There were five hundred Unitarians—men, women, and children—at the Lake Geneva Summer Assembly last summer. Over forty requests for reservations had to be denied. Tapes and mimeographed and printed transcripts of many of the notable addresses have been or are being prepared for loan and sale.

Next summer, the Lake Geneva Assembly will be held during the week of July 5-11, and we will have the entire College Camp and can accept reservations up to 650 or 700.

Last summer, we had our first try at a Rocky Mountain Summer Assembly at Estes Park. We hoped for sixty campers and had two hundred. The Assembly for 1959 at Estes will expand to three hundred; the dates will be July 31 to August 4th, with a full week contemplated in 1960.

Last summer, for good reasons, we cancelled the Limberlost LRY Unitarian-sponsored summer camp but had one at Estes. Now a whole new development has taken place. The national LRY got together in Chicago recently, the leaders of both denominations and of five LRY Federations, and formed MICON, which, being interpreted, is Mid-Continental Regional Federation of LRY. This organization will sponsor four summer youth camp conferences in 1959 within the area of the Western

Conference. Insofar as a denominational adult organization can undergird the efforts of LRY, our Conference will have full responsibility in two of these camps and a shared responsibility in a third.

The Conference Board of Directors has authorized a meeting in Chicago of the Presidents and/or chairmen of the eight Area Conferences for mutual benefit and planning in the near future. This will be a partially joint meeting with our Program-Planning Committee and Universalist leaders will be present also.

The Nominating Committee of the Conference is to meet in person this year and will become a Personnel Committee, building up a file of Unitarian leadership; and in addition to nominating members for the Board will suggest names for the nominating committees of the AUA and the UUA.

Many of our churches have already embarked on procedures for the study and discussion of the Merger Commission's proposals, and suggestions for the best programming of such study will be sent from the Conference Office. The Board of Directors passed two votes concerning the nature of the Western Conference as it could be affected by Merger. The first of these is as follows: "It was voted that we reaffirm to our churches the opinion of the Board as to the maintenance of the historical boundaries of the Conference as now constituted and affirm that no further subtraction therefrom be considered without negotiation with the Western Unitarian Conference and with the local churches and fellowships involved."

Further, "It was voted that in

accordance with the votes of the Annual Meetings of the Western Unitarian Conference in recent years, it is the policy of the Western Unitarian Conference Board to continue to move toward the provision of specialized field services and to seek to preserve a sufficiently large membership base to support and to make economic use of such specialized and multiple-staffed field services."

These votes, with their history and present interpretation, are to be transmitted to our member societies and to the Merger Commission. It is strongly felt that the geographical boundaries of the regions have no fundamental importance in any of the proposals of the Merger Commission.

We have been assured that the rooms on the first floor of 5711 Woodlawn Avenue, Chicago, a building known as Lombard House and owned by Meadville-Lombard, will be available to us for office use next March. There are eight rooms. It is anticipated that the Midwest Universalist Conference will sublet three rooms from us and that we will move our UUA campaign office to that location.

The United Unitarian Appeal Campaign of the Western Unitarian Conference is moving along with increasing pace. This campaign, seeking greatly to increase Western Conference support of the UUA, is under the professional direction of Allied Fund Raising Counsellors, whose president is G. Richard Kuch. Dick Kuch has already made many field visits to churches and fellowships and plans to visit every one of our societies. The program is to give careful

analysis and counsel to each church and fellowship about its own financial needs and resources, and to train laymen in professionally-learned methods of local church fund raising. The results so far indicate that our groups are committing themselves to an average commitment to the UUA of 250 per cent of last year's giving.

Not much can be reported of plans for the April 16-19 Annual Meeting in Denver next year. It is anticipated that we will meet late in the afternoon of Thursday, the 16th, have buffet dinners in Denver homes, and an evening address at the Church; that there will be sightseeing opportunities on Friday afternoon, and that the discussion groups will be sparked by theme addresses immediately preceding them. Much of this was our successful experience at the Montreal General Conference several years ago.

Most of the membership and the Minister of the Bay City, Michigan, Congregational Church have become Unitarian and have joined us. Welcome, then, to the First Unitarian Church of Bay City, Michigan, and to the Reverend Thomas S. Vernon, who has applied for Unitarian ministerial fellowship.

Since the AUA Board decided recently that May Meetings can be held outside Massachusetts, our Board voted to invite the AUA to meet in Western Conference territory in the first year this is possible.

Recently, the Secretary of the Conference has participated in the

installations of Rev. Paul Killinger as minister of our new church at Bloomington, Indiana; of Rev. Napoleon W. Lovely as minister at Cedar Rapids, Iowa; and in the ordination and installation of Khoren Arisian, Jr., as minister of the Iowa City church. As you might expect, this last was referred to as a "Khoren-ation."

The AUA Development Fund, seeking to raise approximately \$3,500,000 for the Association, is being launched under the general chairmanship of Percival Brundage, former Director of the U.S. Budget. The Western Conference President has been asked to write the UUA to determine whether the UUA feels its fund-raising necessities have been duly protected. The UUA is seeking a goal of \$550,000 for national and regional purposes this year.

Through recommendation of the Program-Planning Committee, the Secretary of the Conference is drawing upon the gratis services of a professional research agency to help one of our churches with internal problems of structure and relationships.

The letterhead of the Conference now contains two changes. Dorothy H. Schaad is now our Administrative Assistant and Josephine Matthews has been added as Office Secretary. Our UUA campaign office can be reached directly by addressing mail to Western Unitarian Conference, Room 607-8, 30 N. LaSalle Street, Chicago 2. Our regular office has a new zone number: Western Unitarian Conference, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago 53, Illinois.